Ī	Case 2:05-cv-00099-RSM	Document 32	Filed 10/14/05	Page 1 of 2	
01					
02					
03					
03					
05					
06					
07	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE				
08					
09	BILLY WILLINGHAM,)			
10	Plaintiff,)) Case	e No. 05-0099-RSI	M-JPD	
11	v.)			
12	OFFICER PHILLIPS, et al.,) REP)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION		
13	Defendants.)			
14)			
15	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil				
16	rights action. On August 22, 2005, after the dispositive motion deadline for this case had				
17	passed, the Court issued an order directing the plaintiff to inform the Court as to whether he				
18	wished to continue his pro se status, and directing defendants to show cause as to why counsel				
19	should not be appointed. Dkt. No. 28. Neither party responded timely to the order. ¹				
20	On September 9, 2005, the Court issued a show-cause order directing plaintiff to show				
21	cause as to why his case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, and directing				
22	defendants to inform the Court as to whether plaintiff is still in state or local custody. Dkt.				
23	No. 30. Defendants have responded that plaintiff is not in custody and that they do not have				
24	plaintiff's current address. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has not responded.				
25	There have been no filings by	plaintiff since	oorly, Moy, 2005 on	d nana fram	
26	¹ There have been no filings by plaintiff since early May 2005 and none from defendants since late April 2005. Moreover, it appears that the Court's correspondence to plaintiff, including its order of August 22, 2005, has been returned by the King County Correctional Facility with the notation "out." Dkt. No. 29. ORDER RECOMMENDED FOR ENTRY PAGE -1				

Case 2:05-cv-00099-RSM Document 32 Filed 10/14/05 Page 2 of 2

The show-cause deadline of September 28, 2005, has passed. Moreover, it has been almost five months since plaintiff has filed any court documents or responded to any court order. It appears that plaintiff no longer wishes to prosecute his case. Therefore, pursuant to Local Rule CR 41(b), the Court recommends that this case be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. A proposed Order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 14th day of October, 2005.

MES P. DONOHUE

United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER RECOMMENDED FOR ENTRY PAGE -2